

Reply Brief  
U.S. S/N 09/672,204  
Page 1 of 3

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

**JUL 27 2006**

**PATENT**  
Atty. Dkt. No. Lee 6-1 (LCNT/122291)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of: Lee et al.

§ Case Number: Lee 6-1  
(LCNT/122291)

Serial No.: 09/672,204

Group Art Unit: 2157

Confirmation No.: 8791

Examiner: Osman, Ramy M.

Filed: September 28, 2000

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR  
SONET/SDH RING LOAD BALANCING

**MAIL STOP – Appeal Brief-Patents**  
**Commissioner for Patents**  
**P.O. Box 1450**  
**Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**  
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage for first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, or being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO, on the date indicated below.

7-27-06  
Date

Chelton  
C. W. / 509

**Dear Sir or Madam:**

# REPLY BRIEF

Appellant submits this Reply Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in response to the Examiner's Answer dated June 5, 2006 in the Appeal of the above-identified application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due, including extension of time and excess claim fees, to counsel's Deposit Account No. 20-0782/LCNT/122291.

Reply Brief  
U.S. S/N 09/672,204  
Page 2 of 3

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 27 2006

**REMARKS**

In Section 10 of The Examiner's Answer (Response to Arguments), the Examiner attempts to provide additional reasoning to support his decision of anticipation and obviousness with respect to the claims on appeal. Despite the Examiner's Answer, Appellant still upholds that the rejection of claims 1-23 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) are improper.

The Examiner characterized Morley as teaching facilities having a bandwidth utilization level. Appellant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner contends that Morley states that each span can be a four fiber BLSR span and the transport signals may be routed provided that the total load on any span does not exceed its line capacity. The Examiner is reading the fibers of Morley as equivalent to facilities of the present invention and the spans of Morley as equivalent to the links of the present invention. In the present invention, each facility has a bandwidth utilization level. However, unlike the present invention, Morley determines the capacity of the span. Specifically, the threshold of the span, not the individual fibers of Morley, is utilized. Thus, Morley fails to teach or suggest that each facility has a bandwidth utilization level and performs a different kind of load balancing.

Claim 1 positively states that "each of said facilities having associated with it a respective bandwidth utilization level (304)." Claim 7 positively states the limitation of "a respective bandwidth utilization level for each selected facility." Claim 12 positively states that "determining the bandwidth utilization level for each selected facility within each of said at least one link (312)." Claim 17 positively states that "each one of said plurality of facilities has associated with it a respective bandwidth utilization level (304)." Claim 21 positively states that "a database (150), for storing a respective bandwidth utilization level for each of a plurality of facilities within links (A-H)." On the other hand, Morley states, as explained by the Examiner, the total load of any span does not exceed its line capacity. Morley is silent on any capacity or threshold (i.e. bandwidth utilization level) for each individual fiber (i.e., facility). Therefore, Morley merely teaches having

Reply Brief  
U.S. S/N 09/672,204  
Page 3 of 3

bandwidth utilization level for the link and not each facility. Thus, Morley does not anticipate the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the remaining responses to the Examiner's arguments are addressed by Appellant's Appeal Brief

### CONCLUSION

Appellant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the rejections and pass the claims to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

7/27/06



Eamon J. Wall  
Registration No. 39,414  
Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P.  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702  
Telephone: 732-530-9404  
Telephone: 732-530-9808